

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF OKLAHOMA**

| | | |
|---------------------------|---|-------------------------|
| ANGELE MARCO HENDRICKSON, |) | |
| |) | |
| Plaintiff, |) | |
| |) | |
| v. |) | Case No. CIV-05-779-SLP |
| |) | |
| JAN REDER, et al., |) | |
| |) | |
| Defendants. |) | |

ORDER


Before the Court is Plaintiff's pro se Motion to Reconsider [Doc. No. 57]. Plaintiff asks the Court to reconsider its ruling denying Plaintiff's Motion to Reopen Case and Reinstate Judicial Proceedings [Doc. No. 54]. Plaintiff takes issue with the Court's conclusion that he did not file his Motion to Reopen within a reasonable time.

Under Rule 60(b), the Court may relieve a party from an order for "any . . . reason that justifies relief." Fed. R. Civ. P. 60(b)(6). As Plaintiff acknowledges, "[g]rounds warranting a motion to reconsider include (1) an intervening change in the controlling law, (2) new evidence previously unavailable, and (3) the need to correct clear error or prevent manifest injustice." *Servants of Paraclete v. Does*, 204 F.3d 1005, 1012 (10th Cir. 2000).

Plaintiff, however, reurges the same argument he made in support of his Motion to Reopen. *Compare* Doc. No. 54 at 2, ¶ 10 ("On June 20, 2006 Plaintiff's civil action in this court was dismissed without prejudice by the Honorable Ralph Thompson. Plaintiff did not receive notice of this dismissal and only became aware of the order by recently conducting legal research via LEXI NEXIS.") *with* Doc. No. 57 at 3 ("Hendrickson never

received notice of the Court's June 20, 2006 dismissal of his case and only became aware of the dismissal by stumbling upon the judgment in the detention facility's LEXIS NEXIS database which he has only recently been authorized access to in light of his self-representation in his federal criminal case."). Plaintiff does not cite any intervening change in the controlling law or new evidence that was previously unavailable. Nor does he show any clear error or manifest injustice. A motion to reconsider may not be used to "revisit issues already addressed or advance arguments that could have been made in prior briefing." *Id.* Accordingly, Plaintiff's Motion is DENIED.

IT IS SO ORDERED this 6th day of February, 2025.



SCOTT L. PALK
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE